



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,522	07/11/2003	Tom Etheridge	200210053-1	5065
22879	7590	03/02/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			TALBOT, BRIAN K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1762	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/618,522	ETHERIDGE, TOM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian K. Talbot	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 and 26-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/23/05 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-8 and 26-34 are withdrawn as being directed toward a non-elected invention. Claims 9-25 remain active in the application.
3. This application contains claims 1-8 and 26-30 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper filed 5/10/05. A complete reply to the Office Action must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01. This is the second request.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. In light of the amendment filed 12/23/05, the 35 USC 112 rejection over claims 14 and 15 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 9-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle (3,896,252) or Gedrat et al. (4,285,991) in combination with Miller (4,668,533).

Tuttle (3,896,252) teaches a process of metal plating on plastics comprising aminating the substrate by contacting with a diaminopropane in a solvent, contacting the treated substrate with a noble metal salt (including palladium) and finally contacting the palladium treated substrate with a reducing agent to form a catalyst layer. The catalyst layer is further plated in an electroless plating process (abstract).

Gedrat et al. (4,285,991) teaches method for producing printed circuits whereby a substrate (plate) is contacted with an activating solution comprising a palladium complex and afterwards the substrate having the palladium complex thereon is treated with a reducing solution. Finally a metal coating can be formed thereon (col. 4, line 10 – col. 5, line 55)

Tuttle (3,896,252) or Gedrat et al. (4,285,991) fail to teach the process utilized to form electrically conductive pathways as well as applying the palladium and reducing solution by ink-jetting.

Miller (4,668,533) teaches ink jet printing of substrates to form circuits for the manufacturing of printed circuit boards. Ink jetting is utilized to apply sensitizers and activators (i.e. catalysts) on the substrates in patterns prior to contacting with electroless plating to form the circuits (abstract and col. 2, line 25 – col. 3, line 45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Tuttle (3,896,252) or Gedrat et al. (4,285,991)

process to manufacture circuitry by ink-jet printing as evidenced by Miller (4,668,533)

with the expectation of achieving similar success.

It is noted that in Tuttle (3,896,252) a complex is applied separately from the metal as opposed to being applied as a single solution as claimed and done in Gedrat et al. (4,285,991). While the Examiner acknowledges this fact, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar regardless of the number of steps utilized as long as the process includes steps where a metal and amine complex are combined prior to reducing the metal complex.

With respect to the heating step, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar success regardless of the application of a heating step during the reducing step. If Applicant disagrees, Applicant is invited to supply a showing of unexpected results regarding the criticality of the claimed heating step. It is noted that the showing should support "unexpected" as the prior art clearly shows, while silent, that the process without a heating step is successful.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the references fail when combine have to teach (5) steps required to arrive at the claimed invention and that there is no motivation or reason to combine the references as stated.

The Examiner disagrees. In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some logical reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of references. *In Re Regel* 188 USPQ 136 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that the motivation to make the combination be expressly articulated in one or more of the references; the teaching, suggestion or inference can be found not only in the references but also from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Ashland Oil v. Delta Resins* 227 USPQ 657 (CAFC 1985). The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In Re McLaughlin* 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); *In Re Rosselet* 146 USPQ 183 (CCPA 1969). References are evaluated by what they collectively suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In Re Simon*, 174 USPQ 114 (CCPA 1972); *In Re Richman* 165 USPQ 509, 514 (CCPA 1970).

With respect to the heating step, this has been addressed above.

With respect to the solution being ink-jettable, the Examiner cited Miller which shows that ink-jetting catalyst/sensitizers/activators is known and that one skilled in the art would have a reasonable expectation of achieving similar success with either Tuttle (3,896,252) or Gedrat et al. (4,285,991) catalyst composition.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Talbot whose telephone number is (571) 272-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BKT Talbot 3/1/06

Brian K Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT